RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2 1 2007

<u>REMARKS</u>

.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 11-20 are canceled. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 121

The Office Action requires a restriction to one of the following sets of claims:

- I. Claims 11-20;
- II. Claims 1-10.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects invention II, claims 1-10. However, Applicant respectfully traverses this restriction requirement.

Claims 11-20, to non-elected invention I, are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. It is respectfully urged that the subject application be reconsidered.

The Office Action states that the claims are directed to patentably distinct species of the inventions. A restriction to one invention may be required where two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. See 35 U.S.C. § 121. Two or more inventions are related, and thus are not independent, if they are connected in at least one of design, operation, or effect. See MPEP § 802.01. Examples of two inventions that would not be connected in design, operation, or effect given in MPEP § 806.06 are a process of painting a house and a process of boring a well. These two processes are clearly not connected in design, operation, or effect and are, thus, distinct.

Although the claims are not identical and do vary in breadth, they are connected. The claims do include some similar features such that only a single search would be necessary. Claims cannot be found to be distinct inventions merely because they are drafted as different classes of invention or because they vary in breadth.

Furthermore, examination of the claims would not present an undue burden to the Examiner. Even assuming, arguendo, that the inventions are separately classified, a reasonable search of any one of the inventions would lead the Examiner to search the class and subclass of the other inventions. Therefore, the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2 1 2007

II. Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 21, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa L.B. Yociss

Reg. No. 36,975

Yee & Associates, P.C.

P.O. Box 802333

Dallas, TX 75380 (972) 385-8777

Attorney/Agent for Applicants